

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 remain pending in the application. Claims 1-19 currently stand rejected. The Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks and allowance of the claims.

Claims 1, 6-8, 10, and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,867,483 (Ennis) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,975,594 (Byers). The Applicant respectfully disagrees for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a processing system configured to display a graphical bandwidth level selection indicium and a bandwidth history, *including previous bandwidth selections* on the display device. Neither Ennis nor Byers discloses displaying a bandwidth history including previous bandwidth selections.

The Examiner asserts that Ennis discloses displaying bandwidth history including previous bandwidth selections in figures 11, 13, and 15. However, figures 11, 13, and 15 only show bandwidth utilization history as a percentage relative to 56 kbps. Specifically, bar graph 80 shows bandwidth utilization to the network and bar graph 82 shows bandwidth utilization from the network. Displaying a history of bandwidth utilization does not show a history of bandwidth selections made by a user. Rather, displaying bandwidth utilization history simply shows the amount of available bandwidth used over the displayed time period. Likewise, figures 13 and 15 merely show more detailed versions of bar graphs containing the same bandwidth utilization information as the bar graphs shown in figure 11. Furthermore, the selection referred to by the Examiner in column 15, lines 28-41, only discusses selecting the graph and time intervals that the user wishes to view. The term ‘selection’ does not refer to the information displayed on the graph itself much less refer to the display of a bandwidth selection history, as recited by claim 1. Thus, none of figures 11, 13, and 15, nor any of the other graphs shown or described in Ennis display a bandwidth history including previous bandwidth selections, as recited by claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Ennis and Byers fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 should be allowed accordingly.

Independent claim 10 contains limitations similar to those of claim 1 and, therefore, its allowance is also respectfully requested. Additionally, the Applicant refrains from discussion of the remaining dependent claims in view of their dependence from otherwise allowable independent claims.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-19 in their present form are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of clarity and brevity. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The Applicant believes no fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine fees are necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 210765.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian L. Arment/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Brian L. Arment, Reg. No. 64,134
Setter Roche LLP
Telephone: (720) 562-2280

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Melissa A. Jobe
Sprint
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100